

## In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

## Title: SIMPLIFIED "T" INTERCHANGE DESIGNS FOR HIGHWAY"T" INTERSECTIONS

Application No: 10/716,988 Filing date: 11/18/2003

Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313

## Request to Have Final Rejection Withdrawn

The applicant requests that the 11/19/2007 final rejection be withdrawn. The applicant submits that the final rejection was improper because the examiner did not include information or documents that shows the "NPL" that the examiner refers to that makes the applicants claims obvious. The applicant cannot respond to the reference because it is not included in the office action.

The applicant has found information that appears to be the "Eisenhower Ave. Connector" which the Examiner refers to as "NPL" in the 11/19/2007 office action. The applicant submits that the Eisenhower Ave. Connection to Interstate Highway 495 has no relevance to the applicants claimed invention. The referenced intersection is substantially a "Diamond Interchange." This is an old idea similar to the Diamond interchange shown in prior at FIG. 5 . A diamond interchange is also shown in the line drawings of interchanges from the Federal Highway Administration.

The Interstate Highway 495 has no median what so ever where the Eisenhower Connector (third road surface) meets Interstate Highway 495 (first road surface and second road surface). Also, the Eisenhower Connector (third road surface) passes under both the Interstate Highway 495 east bound lanes and west bound lanes (first road surface and second road surface).

The Eisenhower Connector (third road surface) does not have "a terminated end that is located within the median between the first road surface (Interstate Highway 495 west bound lanes) and the second road surface" (Interstate Highway 495 east bound lanes).

Please review the two aerial photos of the Eisenhower Connector intersection with Interstate Highway 495, which are enclosed herewith.

Also, please review the two street maps of the Eisenhower Connector intersection with Interstate Highway 495, which are enclosed herewith.

It appears that the intersection referred to as the Eisenhower Ave. Connector was originally an underpass connecting Clermont Ave to Clermont Drive. There was no connections onto Interstate 495. At some point in time the Highway Department decided to turn the intersection into a Diamond interchange that functions as a "I Interchange" by adding "on ramps" and "off ramps" and blocking the road onto Clermont Drive.

The applicant submits that the Dallas reference has no relevance to the applicants claimed invention. The "Route 30 Interchange" "yellow" or "third road surface." does not have "a terminated end that is located within the median between the first road surface and the second road surface" The "Route 30 Interchange" "yellow" or "third road surface" passes under the first road surface and also passes under the second road surface.

How can two references that have no relevance to the applicants invention be combined to make the applicants invention obvious? The applicant submits that this is like stating: "zero plus zero equals three!"

The applicant submits that 3 or 4 Simplified "T" Interchange Designs can be built for the same amount of money that would be required for one "Diamond" Interchange or one "Trumpet" Interchange.

Additionally, applicant submits that the Simplified "T" Interchange Designs provide substantially the same amount of safety that "Diamond" Interchanges and "Trumpet" Interchanges provide.

Additionally, applicant submits that the Simplified "T" Interchange Designs can be modified as traffic volume increases to transform them into "Diamond" Interchanges and "Trumpet" Interchanges. (See FIG 14x, 14y, 15x, and 15y.)

Much of he Interstate Highway System in the United States is 50 years old and will be in need of rebuilding soon. (See News Paper article.) Simplified "T" Interchange Designs could be utilized in the rebuilding efforts and possibly in new Interstate and other expressway routes.

The applicant submits that the currently proposed claims clearly define over all prior art.

Date: 2/1/08